

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LORA JOLLIFF,  
Plaintiff(s),

v.

NEVADA CVS PHARMACY, LLC, et al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:21-cv-00098-GMN-NJK

**ORDER**

[Docket No. 14]

Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion for entry of a protective order by which to designate certain materials as confidential. Docket No. 14.<sup>1</sup> The entry of such a protective order is a routine matter that should not be controversial and should almost never require motion practice. Accordingly, the motion for protective order is **DENIED** without prejudice. Counsel are **ORDERED** to continue their meet-and-confer efforts on this issue.<sup>2</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 16, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> The instant motion appears to conflate different issues, including what can be sealed when filed with the Court and whether a protective order should issue by which confidentiality designations can be made. The only issue properly before the Court at this time is whether a protective order should issue by which the parties can designate certain materials as warranting confidential treatment for the purpose of exchanging discovery. The issue of sealing such materials will be addressed if and when a party files confidential materials with the Court.

<sup>2</sup> In the unlikely event that a stipulated protective order cannot be agreed on by counsel, any renewed motion for protective order must include a proposed protective order to issue.